M 578

New York

Friday April 24, 1964

MR. NYLAND: So here we are again, huh? A new week and an old one. Don't let's go into too much detail about Work, huh? I fell off a little bit last week, I think. I hope to--maybe to somebody's annoyance and maybe interesting to someone else. Who knows, because you must remember that getting together on a Friday evening has a very definite reason. And of course it would be silly to assume that we just want to talk around things. And I've called it several times that it has to have a background of some ideas which - you might say - hold water or at least have a certain--a certain assurance, a certain foundation, a certain direction. And it is in perspective with that as the background against which we discuss things of ordinary life, things of inner life, spiritual life, ideas that concern us when we are, you might say, in a state when we want to think a little bit, when we want to get away from ordinary affairs, and what is really the motivation more and more essentially regarding ourselves and our way of living.

And if there is in the way of living something that perhaps we ought to change, or that has a perfectly good reason to be considered and then placed with a certain valuation in our mind or even in our heart, and perhaps later it might be useful in order to do something with it. Because we all agree - I'm quite certain - that

something has to be done in life to apply whatever your philosophy of life is; so that the philosophy is not only a mental and sometimes an emotional question, but that philosophy of life gradually has to become a mode of life, or sometimes with the terminology of a religion of life; quite definitely a motivation of the way you would like to behave or you would like to understand your behavior. And it is against the background of something that is solid enough that could withstand different kinds of criticisms, and perhaps at times could help you to solve some of your problems, some of one's own problems in life, as they undoubtedly present themselves.

So, therefore it is not a question of being satisfied. Rather if one is satisfied and everything is roses, roses, then one need not be interested in Work at all. And although one may assume that it is really a requirement or that it is a necessity for anyone to be interested, the practical result is that there are very few who are interested even for a little while, and many of them gradually would drop off; because when one wants to practice a certain form of life in an ethical or in a real moral sense, one gets a little bit too tired because it means restrictions on certain things that you might say is like a laissez-faire. And not everybody wants that, and particularly not when everything seems to go very well and there is absolutely no need to have any spiritual guidance, because one is so convinced that the way one lives - and the results are there to show it - that everything is just fine and that one is, as Gurdjieff would say, "not the tail of a donkey."

So, with that in mind perhaps there are some questions of that kind of caliber; and those who have been here before - although they are new - perhaps have been able to formulate some questions, or whatever it is that you have on your mind that you would like to talk about. Yah?

Priscilla Saunders: Mr. Nyland, I would like to ask the question of the women...

MR. NYLAND: Of what?

Priscilla: Of the women in the group - various things regarding what it is to be a woman. I've been wondering really what a woman's function is in regard to a man, what the possibilities and the differences are between a woman as a passive principle and a man as the active in regard to some sort of evolution for a human being.

MR. NYLAND: Would you like a man's viewpoint or a woman's viewpoint?

Priscilla: A woman's viewpoint.

MR. NYLAND: A man's?

Priscilla: A woman's.

MR. NYLAND: A women's viewpoint. (Laughter) Well (see you later - lots of luck). Isn't that nice, we men can listen.

I would almost say, are there any women in the house? (Laughter) Well, of course there are but it doesn't mean that they are willing to talk. Is it a question that concerns several of us? Now that's rather difficult to say isn't it? Maybe after we talk a little bit it might start to concern you, but at the present time there seems to be such silence. Now, who - particularly the older people - have any ideas, and what would one say to a young person like that, being a woman herself?

What is the proper attitude that a woman should have towards a man? What a man should be towards a woman? What is the relation between them? What is required? And in general, to link it up with whatwe talked about last week, what is their mutual responsibility? Trudy.

Trudy Bartel: Of all the things in life that have seemed to me difficult, this problem was the one that never seemed difficult to me. To be a woman is--and to know to be a woman is a very wonderful thing. To have a possibility to be a companion, to love, is something very wonderful.

Now the responsibility is, of course, again I feel the responsibility towards my inner being, that I cannot be a companion unless I am. It's very difficult.

MR. NYLAND: I will admit it's rather difficult. But maybe, Priscilla, we can have a man's viewpoint as if he is a woman. You know, after all, a man ought to have some idea of how a woman ought to be. Maybe he is wrong, but if he's a good man he surely should be able to say something. Married or not married, Priscilla?

Priscilla: Well, I don't feel that that term matters as long as a man understands or has had a relationship with a woman, as long as he has had that kind of a...

MR. NYLAND: I think it matters a great deal. When I say married and rearing children and a family, it's quite different from having any sexual relationship.

Priscilla: Oh yes.

MR. NYLAND: So it is not that, and it is not what a man should be or a woman should be regarding the other half. When you have to take him--For instance, a woman becomes a mother, and she's an entirely different person. Woman-female and woman-mother. And one cannot separate it very well in the beginning, because one thing leads quite usually to another. And even if it doesn't, there may be various reasons why one enters into one state, hoping that the other would follow; or that one has very definite objection to becoming a mother, and that all one wishes as a woman - to have someone who takes care of you or to have him around. Not that I want to say that it is on a low plane, but it's quite a different aspect. Come on, you men - talk. Yes.

Taylor Morris: That's right, Mr. Nyland, I feel that it is, it is--you take your life in your hands, in twentieth century America, to try to distinguish between men and women and men and women's rights, sort of. I--I don't think it's any accident that--

that women have children and they are built that way. And yet it makes good sense to me that this active and passive thing is to be taken very seriously. And at the same time must be taken in the right way, that the active--that there is active and passive or that there are active and passive elements in men and active and passive elements in women. And there are women who are more active than certain men and the reverse also. I think that this has to be considered. And I think also that when--when one tries to love - and I think that this would hold true either for a man towards a woman, or a woman toward a man - I think that, in many ways, the active-passive thing is--is set aside while you try and allow the other person to grow and--and set the atmosphere or the surroundings for the other person to grow. Sometimes to take a passive role in relationships at certain times takes I think a good deal of--of a man to allow and--and to be passive at certain times. And I think that it's the leadership of the man to--to try and--and discover when it is best to--to be passive, when it is best to be active and this leadership is I think more the active part, and the experience is really difficult, but I'm not sure that one really...

Trudy: Well I think here again this is a point where there's no difference between--because in the wish to help the other person to grow - and of course to try to grow myself - from man to woman and from woman to man, there is a necessity to remain passive, and sonsciously so. So this is...

Taylor: (Which becomes) active.

Trudy: Which becomes active, especially when it is very difficult.

MR. NYLAND: Now there is a problem, huh? Should a man who is by nature active become passive in a relation to a woman? Trudy.

Trudy: Pardon me?

MR. NYLAND: A man who is an active principle, should he become passive in

relation to a woman or in any relationship?

Taylor: Would you define again, like conscious...

Trudy: (That) is not passive.

MR. NYLAND: Yah, but unconscious, we're talking about unconscious.

(Priscilla): I'm thinking in certain areas that this would be quite possible. In areas of life between woman or a man.

MR. NYLAND: Depends.

(Priscilla:) Where--where the woman is within the confine of active and passive, where the woman becomes the active member in simple matters of household.

MR. NYLAND: Sure.

(Priscilla): In simple matters of every day decision...

MR. NYLAND: That's right.

(Priscilla): ...which a man is not particularly concerned with.

MR. NYLAND: Yah, but it doesn't mean that we're now talking about abnormal cases; we're talking on--in general, what a woman in general should be. That we know, by experience of certainly having looked around enough, we know very well that there are many aberrations regarding relationships between man and woman; and that because of sometimes economic conditions, or whatever it may be, the desire on the part of the woman to be somebody and who has - to use the phrase - the pants on, certainly in the presence of such a person a man behaves a little differently than perhaps his masculinity could want him to; excluding even many different aber--aberrations in the direction of homosexuality and lesbianism.

But we're not talking about that. We're talking about an average person as a woman with an average man as a man, and a relationship between them, and what should be the proper attitude of a woman regarding that and what should be expected

of the man, and as a result perhaps of that, how should the reaction be of the woman. It's really then we're excluding a little bit people who want to make their own--their own bed and sleep in it. That is, the female executive or the--the typical woman who is an authority about this and that - you know? - and has to make not only a living but also tries to make a name, and probably in the process steps on someone every once and a while; and doesn't want to get married because she doesn't want to be bothered, or she thinks herself superior and is already an executive type to start with.

I think those are also exceptional cases. Not that they don't exist and that there are quite a number of them, and that at the present time our educational system, and also economically speaking, that they are more in the foreground than they ever have been, particularly since women's suffrage - now they can vote, so therefore they have something to say. And of course they are recognized because they have a vote and so forth, and even the Daughters of the American Revolution - all of them have their ideas, from whatever politics should be or how to manage a garden.

I mean--but it is not--We are talking about an essential quality of a woman and an essential quality of a man, and that is what Priscilla is interested in. How should she as an essential woman behave regarding a man, and what could she expect from a man? And what is her proper attitude towards him? Right, Priscilla?

Priscilla: Yes.

MR. NYLAND: Yes, tell us.

Priscilla: Well, it seems to me that this is putting the cart before the horse because in order to become something, to become woman you have to become yourself first, (because)...

MR. NYLAND: Again it is a problem. You know it depends entirely on one's

viewpoint if man and woman should join in order to make one unit, or is man as he is and woman as she is already sufficient unto themselves? This is one -- one statement.

The other is, that if I believe that it is necessary for me to become something first, before I would want to marry or at least have any kind of relationship with a woman, that then I may wait a little bit longer in order to get that kind of education, practice - whatever it is - and in that particular direction I may become a little bit more limited, so that the possibility of joining up with someone later, naturally is also quite reduced.

This is again an extreme case, but it doesn't mean that I would have to wait until I am thirty or forty years before I would have any particular relationship, let alone get married. Because here is another question that comes up in every person's life. There is a certain moment at which--in which they are sexually mature and what is this attraction between the sexes? Is it something that really there is a desire for further unity or is it based on a chemical attraction? And if that is the case - which undoubtedly enters, without any question about it - then it may depend entirely on what are the opportunities for either a man or a woman to meet the right kind of a person; and also if in my development it may be necessary to have any sexual relationship in order to develop for myself, to know what I want or to know even what I am.

So it is not so easy to put the question of, 'I want to develop first, before I want to get married or have any relationships,' because maybe exactly that will help me to develop. You see? (P: Umhm.) So it is not a question of putting it before the horse. It's a question of what is reasonable, and can reasonably be expected in a society as we at the present time live on, because that is another question that we still have to consider.

If we were a primitive people or if we were farmers living in one little village, the relationship between man and women are definitely quite different from what we have at the present time. And the customs that are among the so-called savages or the aborigines, certainly cannot be compared to the customs of the Eskimoes, or the customs of people who live in Samoa. And what we do here in New York probably is not the same as what we do in New York state.

So again we drift away from different particular examples that we remember and then we start to generalize from that. And really the problem ought to be solved from the standpoint of what is generally applicable in the case of a man or a woman, assuming that we are, in that aspect, more or less normal. You see, what is this development that a man and woman should have? Priscilla, do you think it is necessary that they meet?

Priscilla: That they -- you mean the development of each?

MR. NYLAND: Yes, for instance there are educational systems where the boys are kept separate from the girls.

Priscilla: Oh, I see.

MR. NYLAND: You know, it--it happens that even in certain church religions, like the Quakers, they -- one half sits on one--in one side of the church and the other in the other side.

Priscilla: Well, you see, I was brought up to believe that a woman is absolutely equal to a man in everything. She should have the same education; she should be allowed the same rights, the same privileges; she should go anywhere a man goes, practically.

MR. NYLAND: Well, who agrees with that?

Priscilla: Well, I would....

Someone: I -- I doubt it because....

MR. NYLAND: Good, then we can leave it alone because I think that we don't agree. It may be an idea, being brought up like that by your father or mother, whatever the relationship was, or the family relation, but it is not, not the--it, it won't hold any water will it. Whatever a woman wants to do, she ought to be free to do it, but there are many things that are excluded from a woman. Even if we so-called say they are equal, they are not, and everybody knows it.

Priscilla: I don't think (that he) doesn't know it.

MR. NYLAND: Oh yes, they do. There is always that kind of a consideration, that there are still -- You see now it is a question of principle, because that we at the present time are not living any more according to certain principles which should be in each man; that, I think, is one of the fundamental causes why we don't understand the relationship. Simply take an example: a man has to take an initiative and a woman should follow. This may be a statement which one can question, but it is in any relationship of a man and woman that a man all the time has to take the initiative regarding that what ought to be done. This is naturally so, and it should be economically so; and as far as relationships in life is concerned, it is completely forgotten. For instance, politeness, or let's say on the subway that you give your seat to someone else, it's almost primeval, you know, it doesn't happen. But you are out in a party, and it happens to be twelve, one o'clock, and there is a girl that has to go home, and all you say, "Take a taxi." Who goes at the present time out of their way in order to make sure that his own principles - now, I'm now talking about a man - his principles are fulfilled. It is a trait of his character to know what he should be - not that it has to be accepted, and not that necessarily it has to be forced

on someone - but for himself, a person has to have a certain foundation; that is, what he is essentially with all his make-up and education - whatever conclusions he has reached - he has to establish for himself a certain level where he wishes to be, and below which he does not want to go.

This is quite necessary to understand and particularly from the standpoint of a man, and to a certain extent, it belongs also to a level of a woman. This I think is a requirement in the first place, that he as a man and she as a woman has to know whatever their world is, and they will allow certain things to come in and other things not to come in. For instance, a person lives in ordinary life and associates with friends who swear all the time, or who crack dirty jokes, or who want to drink, or perhaps who have habits, other habit forms - ideas, you know - whatever it may be. There may be a certain someone entering into that kind of a circle and sniffs a little bit and says, "This is not for me." A person is used to certain things in his surrounding and cannot help be affected by it. When it comes to reading certain pulp magazines, one pulls up one's nose and says, "No, that is not the kind of way I want to spend my time; I want to read so and so."

Whatever it may be, whatever the level is that one wants to establish for oneself, there is a certain something that is related to the ideal of what a man or a woman should become, which at the present time in its potentiality is already there but not formed. And if we put it first on that kind of a basis - What should a woman be as she is now; and then, as she will grow, what does she want to grow into? - I think you come much closer to answering the particular problem. For instance, it becomes quite an individual affair: I am, as a woman, willing to marry or have a family and become a mother; I am, as a woman, willing to continue to live in celibacy and make my own living, and

try to become an executive, and perhaps reach the state of where I become the head of Lord and Taylor. Whatever it may be that is in my mind, that I as a woman feel and that I believe in that something that is possible for me and in which I would be happy, or rather where I would find a solution for my life if I take my life seriously, it all depends what I then would expect of a man. In one case I would have a relationship of a certain kind where a man quite definitely functions, and the other simply would be a relationship as friends with whom I really don't want to have too much to do because I might be afraid that I would fall in love.

Regarding a woman, whatever is normal for her: In my opinion, of course, it is normal for any woman to wish to be married, to wish to have children. I think it is abnormal that one doesn't want them - not that it doesn't happen and that circumstances many times prevent. It is not right for a woman to live alone and neither is it right for a man to continue to live alone. I don't mean by that sexually, because on the sexual basis there are many other reasons why there is a difference between a man and a woman, not only that there is an activity and a passivity, but there is also polyandry, and perhaps what I've many times called monotony. (Laughter) So it is not that kind of question; we leave it out because normally there is a desire which in the higher functions of a man's life are expressed in his sexual wish and surely in the life of a woman the same thing appears.

That it is linked up with the question of children, you might say, is not a freak of nature, but I would agree with Taylor of saying that there is something quite definitely meant by that, and perhaps it is not only linked up with the continuation of the race. It is a possibility of the development that in both the

man and the woman as mother and father will have when they have children which they cannot possibly get any other way, and surely not even by adopting children. There is quite definitely some reason for woman being born out of man, that she is part of man, like Adam's rib, and that for some reason again she has to be replaced in some way as to become an entity.

It links up, of course, with a philosophical question. Is it really that each person is looking for a unit that is to become one? I believe so; I think it is absolutely necessary that each person should become one, and the question is now, can they become one better when they are together or should they become one when they are still separate and then join. I think the difficulty is that if they are already one by themselves, that very seldom there will be any desire to join each other than only in a mutual effort to accomplish something else which is outside of themselves.

There is, of course, a certain point at which a man and woman should join; that is, if it's a question of giving and taking, there has to be something that can be given and something that can receive it. So exactly the same way as when one says "I want to Work on myself", I cannot apply it to little children because they don't have enough experience. In exactly the same way a man and woman should not either have any sexual relationship or get married until they have something to go by, and not base it simply on a natural phenomenon of sexual interest.

So regarding this particular problem, a woman should at a certain time know what she wishes and also understand she is not only physical body, and that there is something in a woman that looks for a protection; and that there is something in a man who should give it, that is without any question. But the

man has to be educated first that he considers woman in the proper place and not considers herjust as a little bit of a plaything. So that a proper attitude of a man towards a woman will reflect on the woman in corresponding to that what a man is; and this is what women are waiting for. They cannot become what they should be unless men are what they should be; and the mistake is always made by the man and not by the woman. After a woman has had a chance to be in the presence of a man and then not to respond, that's her fault. But otherwise the responsibility rests with man, and it is illustrated in very few little things and big things in life; and at the present time our educational system is not adjusted to teach a man or a body, or a young man, manners based on a principle. It need not go so far as in the Middle Ages, that a knight runs around and establishes himself, and sings songs like the troubadors. I don't mean that. But it does mean that one considers a woman for the place wherever she is, and that in relation to that, this particular man starts to function as a positive force regarding a negative one. It places on him that responsibility, and it places on a woman the responsibility to remain negative in the presence of a positive force, and not to assume anything that belongs to a man and by right relongs to him, but give him a chance to develop in that direction. If she is able to remain passive whenever it is necessary, it will produce in the man exactly that kind of capacity.

So you see, the problem is not that easily solved, because what falls in love with whom? How does it happen all the time? I say practically, because it is chemical attraction, or it just happens because one happens to meet, and one follows in many instances the line of least resistance, and then there is hell to pay. Usually it is already a little bit this way and that way. And it is

not a question that one is puritanical, but it's a question that in this particular thing which is so 'hervorragend', so paramount in ordinary life, that is, this question of so-called sexual love, that one feels that whenever that happens, that then there is already a relationship which should either religiously extend until eternity, or can be broken off just at the scratch of a pen.

It is dependent on what is a man, and what can he be. Then a woman will find her proper place. A man has to be, regarding a woman, not only a protector, but a person who gives initiative and can tell at the proper time what ought to be done for mutual benefit - not selfishly. This is where many men make a mistake: either they are too lukewarm to think about it, or they become autocratic and then they have conditions - like many times, take the German house father who simply commandeers his wife, and his wife is nothing else but a little cook, and when the meal is not on time that he scolds her, et cetera, et cetera, and all she's good for is to have a couple of children with. That is not a man. A man takes initiative, he protects a woman in life, he takes care of the ordinary affairs, and leaves her room to take care within her realm, which in many cases is her house, or whatever her home may be or whatever the responsibility is that is assigned to her, the proper place, and helps her to fulfill that. When woman understands this, in the presence of a man a woman will start to become really a woman; and it is necessary for a woman to understand that she needs a man in order to be what she ought to be. Otherwise you cannot separate a woman from a man. A woman without a man will never develop into the proper kind; either she will be an indescribable monster or she will always remain infantile.

This has nothing to do with what is required as far as consciousness is

concerned or what really should be an ideal state. I'm only saying that a man ought to be in such and such a way, and our education doesn't help him because no one talks about it, and no one tells a man how he ought to behave. And in the little things he is already so negligent; and this amateurish nonsense that we now at the present time practice, simply taking a girl out and then paying for it and not to go Dutch, or whatever it may be - all of that is blah-blah.

One has to be. This is a requirement of a man in the first place; and then when he is, that is, when he is convinced of principles for himself and lives in accordance with his conscience, then he will do certain things that will be allowed by his conscience. And one of the things that are proper to his conscience is to leave room for the possible development of other people, and particularly for the person he loves, if he really says and wants to show that he loves her. Then a woman can understand where she is at. And what does it mean: to be able to tell, to be able to create, to be able to divine, to be able to know what is really the proper thing to do or the proper thing not to do, when to wait, when to be patient, what to say, how to say, not to say certain things, to wait and to be the wise man who, as it were, looks at the person he loves as something in his charge for the possibility of that person's development; and in that sense creates conditions constantly for the possibility for that person to grow in the direction belonging to that woman, if he loves her.

So that there is constantly room for development, for expansion, for the growth of such a woman in order to fulfill her place regarding the man who claims that he loves her. This is very important to understand, because it is the creation of that kind of a condition, and it is not the creation of having a house and two cars and a garage. It's a creation of an atmosphere; it's a

creation of something that one feels when one enters and knows that there is that kind of relation between them; and usually it's called understanding between man and wife or lover and his beloved. That in that, that direction, in that way, the creation of that kind of a world, there is a fulfillment. There is a fulfillment for the man to know what he should do and tries it and then at his own sacrifice and a great deal of cost sometimes, allows certain things to proceed because he has created them.

The question of creation of man is three-fold. It is a relationship with a woman in the first place, to create a world for her. The second is that he creates, regarding a woman, the possibility of a family, and the third is the creation in man of becoming man himself. For this last part he needs a woman because no one will be able to develop his centers - and this is a little bit of Gurdjieff - will be able to develop his centers in the proper way so that they can grow out to Kesdjanian or Soul body unless he has, at the proper time, the help - and not sexually - but the kind of understanding that is necessary in order to have a reflex on him to find out that what he has done, that it was correct. This is what a woman should do. She should reflect what comes from him in the proper way. I mean by that, in such a way as not to be hurt, understand where it came from, and at the proper time, with patience, be able to say, "Such and such a thing was not right. Please try; I understand what you want, I understand your meaning, I know your intentions, but such intentions at the present time do not fit me because I am not as yet what perhaps you would like me to be."

This form of love is quite a different thing. It means that one is actively engaged in trying to build a relationship between two people, and that

the initiative coming from the man is received by the woman, and reverted again to the man. It is a question of giving and taking. But it is not a question of giving and therefore I take and return. It is not a gift which is counteracted by another gift. It is a gift which stands on its own feet, and can continue to stand like that and be given constantly without having ever anything returned; simply because when one gives there is a satisfaction for oneself of having given that what is right, and that is the compensation. That it might produce in the other person the wish also to give - and exactly that kind of a gift again becomes the same thing for the other person because it is complete in itself, and it does not require another gift again from the husband.

One starts to build one brick and another - in that sense man and woman are the same. They both Work; they both are active; they both try to understand each other. That is their equality; but it does not mean that one has to go out in the woods for five miles and walk and the woman has to do the same thing. Maybe it is her place to sit at home at times and maybe to knit while the husband is fishing. Who knows this? Only those who start, and start with a potential. The potentiality has to be in each man or woman before they ever should lay hands or eyes on each other, so that they already know what perhaps they could expect because they themselves in the expectation know what is lacking in them.

It is this kind of wisdom that is required first, that I know what I am and I also know what I may wish and in what respect I could be filled; and then I will look. And it won't take me very long to find out if I find the right person or not; and I will not waste my time in all kind of sexual directions. It is not in that direction that unity is. It is only one - the unity between man and woman in three-fold: sexually, emotionally, and intellectually. And neither one can

take the substitute or be substituted for the others. And the most ideal case - if it is really the possibility of a three-fold unity, that would be most ideal. And in many cases, of course, it doesn't exist; again I say, because we are not educated in that direction.

So you see what I mean. To be really loved means you are better. In the presence of something that is really superior as far as a woman is concerned, because of its activity, you can pray that you will receive it in the proper way and that then with that and molding it and digesting it and making it your own, it produces in one a certain state of, "How wonderful, such thing is possible for me, now I also become active in my way."

What other questions are there? We don't want to talk about marriage and love all the time, do we?

Questioner Two: Well, I have a question in relation to this...

MR. NYLAND: Good, good.

Questioner Two: ...that I'd like to ask you. Is there no substitution in--for the fulfillment of having a child and being able to bear children?

MR. NYLAND: Yes, there is a substitution. There are many things that are substitutes, but it is ersatz; it is not the same. It is a substitute and sometimes the substitutes are pretty close. For instance, if one adopts a child, one has a difficulty in bringing a child up. One can even start loving it. One can have a cat instead of a child and uses one's emotions in order to produce within oneself a feeling of wanting to care. It is not necessarily to have a child in that sense that one can require, or rather that one can derive from a relationship of bringing up of a child certain things which, of course, can be done with any kind of a child, not only your own.

But the questions is, if something belongs to me, if something was of me, if something was created by me, it is different. It is almost as different as when I buy a table and it is very useful, or if I make a table. It's quite a different thing. One does not know until one experiences it. To ask a father what is it to be a father, he will not be able to tell you. But two fathers will be able to understand each other. It is one of those things that one has to have the experience in order to be able even to talk about it, but it is not the question that one ought to be sad if one doesn't have the experience.

The substitutes at the present time in our livin--in our age at the present is a little bit easier than it used to be fifty years ago. I mean, there is a certain freedom at the present time. One can get almost as much out of it by having just -- by living together. It is not a child as yet, although the difficulties that are there and perhaps, let's say, if one would become pregnant and the problem is: what will I do? It is quite all right even in a certain form of imagination, to see what I would do 'if'. It is never the same, but it can be, as I said, quite close to it. And sometimes imagination is very much like an author who writes a book about the psychological behavior of different people. He cannot live each psychological entity because he himself is limited. At the same time, with his imagination, trying to put oneself into the shoes of someone else, one can reach quite definitely conclusions.

It is absolutely possible for anyone who has that kind of facility of mind to be able to visualize things without having had the experience, and still the experience is a little different. I can write a book about a beautiful country that exists somewhere and I can use the knowledge of people who have been there and

describe it, and describe it in such a way that it looks almost as if I've been there. I can even go so far and say, now you go on that road, you'll see a house on the left and then there is another road off on the right side, and if you follow that it climbs down the mountain, and afterwards there's marvelous panorama over such and such a city. One can write about that, but it is not the same if I were there and actually walked.

So even what is the difference between an actor and real life? It is that. A person can play Hamlet as if he is Hamlet - really feel it. A person can play Beethoven and it is not Beethoven; he plays as if he were. Each person is different. I cannot be the same person with children or without. I can as woman become a mother, but I'm a mother only when I have a child of my own.

You see what I mean - that there are reasons why it sometimes cannot be fulfilled or that I must accept ersatz and must accept substitutes. I do that thousands of times in life. I can imagine what it is to have five cars, or when I read about the Shah of Persia - he has ten - and then I get jealous and wouldn't it be nice to have this and that and that? It's not the same as having just one little Plymouth.

The further one gets away from life as expressed in phenomena, that is, the further one goes to a noumenal value of life, the easier it is to understand that although there is a difference in phenomena, there is less and less difference in noumena. I mean by that, if I live on the periphery, many things for me belong to that periphery and are different because they are on the circumference of the circle. But if for some reason or other I follow any one of the radii down to the center of the circle, the closer I come to the central point, the less differences there are in circumferences of circles that I can

draw; until finally if I do reach the center there is no more difficulty about distinctions.

So when it comes to a question of substitution, I have to get away from the circumference; and as soon as the circumference doesn't exist anymore and has become a central point, I am then as such a different man. But now I'm talking about what is possible for a man to create himself when he is in that sense harmonious, then his woman will be almost all women. And the same applies for a woman: to become one, all men is one man to her. But you see, we were not talking about that.

Who has something to add? Yes?

Questioner Three: I'd like to know how can one evolve in terms of the Gurdjieff system because, for example, the people that lived in the 1920's and that were direct disciples of Gurdjieff, they had something to look forward. Every single meeting they were introudced to new ideas about themselves, about the Universe, and they had something to look forward. It was kind of a suspense, and Gurdjieff expected them to Work on themselves, et cetera. And most of the people in this room, I assume, have read Ouspensky and Gurdjieff to some degree, and understand it to some degree, and we come together here and talk about personal problems. And I don't necessarily see how we involve or how we can evolve with your help in terms of the system by talking about personal problems.

MR. NYLAND: Now, you see, we're on the borderline now. (Laughter) Huh, Bruce, what will you answer? You have to answer it, because it--it cannot be just a question and say, "We don't answer that", or like Ouspensky used to say, "That's no question." (Laughter) Now you thought that very clever.

Bruce Arcieri: Well, I don't think I can really answer it because...

MR. NYLAND: Can you hear it?

Bruce: ...my scope is not wide enough. I think a teacher would have to really answer that question properly. But the feeling I have generally, a way toward that would be to say while a man may have a lofty ideal to try to evolve in life, the fact of being in life is, I would say, not--not--not even--not only is it of equal emphasis, but more and more, in my own attempt, for example, in becoming interested in the evolution but I have maybe more intimate feeling about it than I would like if evolution of my own emotional connections with my wish.

I find that my concern with ordinary life and seeing it almost in comparable terms to what you have just been saying about (a) spoke of a wheel and to come down to an understanding of noumena as being, let's say, the heart or soul of phenomenal experience. One has to deal continually with one's phenomenal experience; maybe hopefully coming more and more to what you might call a noumena of oneself, or the, let's say, what we call essence, personality as being a distinction. And as far as what we do here, we're speaking of ordinary life questions. There are other groups where other kinds of questions are dealt with in more depth. But this, the considerations that we hopefully consider tonight are--they have their place in...

MR. NYLAND: Does that satisfy you?

Questioner Three: Not really.

MR. NYLAND: No. Who will give satisfactory - more satisfactory - because what Bruce says is quite right, you see, but it ought to be elucidated. Yes. Oh, Terry. Excuse me.

Terry (Owens?): I was particularly struck by the questioner's statement about Gurdjieff's students having these experiences of new ideas being continually revealed to them; and, of course, I never have met Gurdjieff or been in that situation with Gurdjieff, but I would say most emphatically that I have (this) experience coming to groups here, and to such an extent that I almost wouldn't be able to find words to express that. I think what perhaps might not be clear to the questioner is the purpose of this group, perhaps, and then the question of: if one is interested in evolution one can discuss personal problems ad infinitum, and perhaps never come upon a method for internal evolution. And the purpose of this group is not to expound the method. But I don't think, that is to say, that the method that Gurdjieff has left is not taught. It is.

MR. NYLAND: I don't--I don't think that he considers that. Maybe you are not enough familiar, I think, with--with what exists regarding Gurdjieff - Work or ideas. I do not know. Terry is quite right that there are other groups. But if you would like to find out a little bit, something like a substitute - which is not real - it's reading In Search of the Miraculous and there, chapter after chapter, certain things are disclosed exactly the same way as Gurdjieff did it in St. Petersburg. I think that comes to some extent if one is looking for something. Perhaps that might be a very good line to follow, if there were no other ways. But quite definitely anyone - and the purpose of a group of this kind is having Gurdjieff's ideas as background - anyone who's interested in delving into that a little bit further, there are other opportunities.

Questioner Three: I was thinking perhaps -- What jumped into my mind was your analogy of the mother who is capable--of the woman who was capable of

having a child and the one who was not. And since Gurdjieff is a sort of a father of the system, that perhaps the experiential part of that, when coming in direct contact with him, would be different for those people, since we have an indirect source - let's say, reading - much like the people who were directly involved with Jesus had a different experience than the people, let's say, the Christians of the twentieth century.

MR. NYLAND: I'm quite sure.

Questioner Three: And this perhaps is inevitable, but it doesn't necessarily mean that it would invalidate reaching the same point.

MR. NYLAND: So, the question is only if people who have met Gurdjieff and were under the influence, of course, had a certain advantage because there was the guru himself in person, and whatever would come from him naturally would be accepted as - perhaps if one had belief in him - as gospel truth, or at least it would be something that the wise man said, and it is not an interpretation. At the same time, if Gurdjieff did his job, as it were, well enough, he left certain things in order to carry on or rather to enable some people to maintain the ideas for whatever they were worth. So that, even with Gurdjieff, although he may have been the person through whom the ideas became known, that gradually in contact with him, the personality of Gurdjieff was more and more pushed in the background, and the ideas in the foreground; so that if one is sure that the ideas are correct like Gurdjieff expounded them - and that is of course another question, that is, that there is enough exactness in the ideas that they are really that way and not personally interpreted like many times has happened and is happening - that if one is sure that the ideas are pure as such, that gradually it is not so much necessary anymore to have heard

Gurdjieff if one is interested in the ideas. And that Gurdjieff, still as a person who remains through whom much of this reaches us, or at least who has been instrumental in formulating it, that one feels towards that a curiosity: "I wished I had known him, or if I had know him then certain other things would be possible." It's exactly the same as with Christianity, that if one had known Christ, it would have been quite different from the present day Christians.

So it is always that way: whoever has lived before and happens to have died and I've become interested in him, I'm sorry that I didn't live at that time. There is nothing that--that can be changed about that because with many of these things we're always too late and we--we don't see what happens at the present time. And it is not that the present time that is--is so wonderful, but certainly it is not looked at the same way as something that has already gone by and say, "I'm sorry I wasn't living then." It usually is as if death or the disappearance of a person increases the halo around, whereas if it is only taken as a person, one can understand it. I say, Maharshi under a palm tree, I wished I'd seen him. It would have been wonderful. If I had met Buddha, it would have been just glorious. But I'm not there. But what he has said at the present time has a meaning. And perhaps that meaning can produce in me a desire to become like Gurdjieff, and if I'm like Gurdjieff - I mean for everyone - we don't need it. You understand what I mean?

If there is a real desire of search for truth, for ideas for oneself, if it is a desire that I wish to become - not like Gurdjieff necessarily because he was whatever he was - but if there is an indication of a possibility of growth, of evolution, of developing of oneself in the direction that is more - let's say - becoming or at least that belongs to one, or to use the one term, harmonious

man, then I will go out of my way to find out how can I get this and that and that. I would start reading, I would ask questions, I would find out what is happening. Who is there? Who has known Gurdjieff? What is he doing? Is there still someone who can tell me about it? Is it is--what he has, remarkable man as he has written about in--himself in that kind of book and all the - I would, I would not stop. And on your--your peregrinations regarding that, you would probably meet many possibilities of different groups who also talk about Gurdjieff and the ideas a little bit more in detail. I would almost say you're welcome.

What else is there? What else is there important? Else something. You know what I mean.

If you bring something yourself; that is, if you put yourself in a little different state of wanting to ask something like you try to formulate which you don't know how to formulate, then if you do know how to formulate it - something that perhaps you would say when you're all by yourself - that if you try to bring that as a question and then take the big step and saying something in the presence of other people, it would require on your part such a tremendous effort that you would never forget it, and it might help you to come much closer to a possible development of yourself, since you have attempted something quite extraordinary.

And it is this that we really are talking about: not to let things go on in a very nice easy flowing oily way, but to put ourselves in a situation where we are not convinced that we even could carry it out; and that we are confronted every once in a while with this impossibility of having to do something and still an inner desire which forces us to do it, and to make us, for the sake of developing, to say certain things that might even then contribute also to other people, and surely by which you could profit more than anyone else. It is exactly that that

will help one to grow. It is not easy and it is something that has to be done, perhaps well thought out, and you don't want to give yourself away too much, or expose it so that someone else will look at you and say, "Who is this kind of a fellow? What did he really want?"

Whatever you can get out of it, whatever you put yourself into - any kind of a difficult situation - because of the friction that is created it may be quite useful; and not only that it would become a little bit unforgetful, but that at the moment you try it, something would take place in you. And you would, because of that, break the humdrum existence of yourself of constantly listening or constantly reading or only opening your mouth in the presence of those people with whom you are friends, and where there is no harm and nothing to be ashamed of. It requires something: that you want to be exposed and that you run the risk that someone dislikes you.

Questioner Four: I've wanted to ask you a long time about hope, and I find that I--I sort of cringe every time you speak about it - hope and wishing - because my--my experience with it and my observation of it has always been that people -- well, I've always heard it defined as fear of the present, that it's sort of an inability for a person to get with one's efforts, that it's always, you know, something one lays off and relies on in terms of fantasy; and the way you use it under the same proj--feeling that it is a projectile and not as a motivation or motivating force.

MR. NYLAND: Hope is based upon the possibility that it might be fulfilled. Otherwise we wouldn't hope. A belief is something that you are almost certain that could come--become true. But you're not so sure about it. For hope, there has to be a reason that there is a reasonable hope, otherwise it is useless.

So when I use the word hope, it means that I am already partly inclined to believe that the possibility for me exists in the future, and I hope it will come about. So in that sense, having more or less the belief and the certainty that something will happen, my hope is a motivating force, hoping for the future that in the future something happens that I--that is desirable. I hope for that. So why can it not -- at the present time really if I hope in that sense, based naturally on a reasonable assumption - not hoping for going to the Moon - I have to have a preparation in order to have that kind of a hope, so that it becomes reasonable. But why shouldn't one have hope of that kind?

Questioner Four: Why are we going to the Moon?

MR. NYLAND: If you want to go to the Moon, you have to prepare.

Someone: How about the same analogy of mother and child, the mother has a child, a little infant. She has certain wishes. She wishes that this child will grow to be a certain--to--to fulfill a role in life as a human being, various aspects fulfilled. She has a wish that this be so. This doesn't negate everything she does and the way she brings up the child to make it be so. Everything she does is--is an attempt when she can to fulfill this.

MR. NYLAND: Well, you know hope springs up eternally in the human breast. There's no one without hope. And if one says it is hopeless, it is pretty bad. There were a few people who believed that things are hopeless. Everyone has hope regarding whatever it may be: a child, maybe; it may be a business; it may be a friend; it may be any kind of a thing. Everyone hopes. Also, I think, a little child hopes to grow up. It is not sharply defined, but I think there is a tendency which is expressed in its desire to wish to grow. And gradually, as it grows, it starts to protect that form of life, in order to

continue to grow.

For hope is, almost I would say, universal. I do not understand why you really object to it. You don't like the word hope? You're full of it. (Laughter)

Questioner Four: Thank you, I think.

MR. NYLAND: I am quite certain. Yes, Lou.

Lou Castagno: This has something to do with the question the gentleman brought up before about the nature of the meeting, and I--for myself I don't think it was satisfactorily discussed. And it is, it is a necessity of every day ordinary life and the material of that life, of its use--of its use in any kind of Work, any kind of evolution. I think that that's something that we could discuss, but I would like to discuss and hear more.

MR. NYLAND: The necessity of anything possible regarding evolution in general, more general?

Lou: The conditions of ordinary life as the gentleman stated that we discuss personal problems and conditions. For myself, I don't think--I think it's unavoidable.

MR. NYLAND: Of course it is, but it is a question of specifics because he referred to Gurdjieff. That a person in ordinary life is interested in his own development, that is already from early life apparent in anyone. And without becoming provincial, I would say that a person is made up of three centers, and that for each of the centers he hopes that his center will grow out to its full development; and that for many people the development of this one or another or the third center is sufficient for the development and the end of their personality as he wants to behave as a man on Earth and fulfill his functions here. It will be all the time, wherever I am and in what particular

direction I want to go - physically or emotionally or intellectually - when--as long as I am still alive in the sense of being alive on Earth, that I need not have any particular aspirations to get away from Earth, and that I don't have to have necessarily a desire to develop any spiritual existence, but that I can continue with filling myself with all kind of beautiful things, physically, emotionally and intellectually. It's quite satisfactory. I probably reach the end of my earthly existence without ever having a chance to think about inner values. I can fill my life with so many new things almost every day in this kind of society. I may also fill it with a little suffering when I have to earn a living. But at least when I postpone the possibility of buying - as I said - ten cars instead of only having one measly one, probably I will find some means by which gradually I will be satisfied; and unless I lose the desire of life, I will continue to live in hopes that I will evolve.

If we want evolution, that is in the right direction, or if there is a possibility of its stopping at a certain point, reaching its own maturity - like physical center, like physical body reaches a maturity and does not grow further, that perhaps logically, emotionally speaking, I also reach a certain level and then forget about it; and intellectually that my mind is only capable of a certain development, and no further - that may be so, but perhaps only by living that I will find out how I myself keep on repeating this and that and the other - time and time again. Then we come to whatever man is at the present time, provided he sees it. He may be a man ( ) and he may be a man of very limited feeling; and after a little while he is quite satisfied by having just - I've said several times - having a little tea party or cocktail or a party every year and celebrating his birthday. And for the rest, if he has

two or three weeks vacation and then can go out West, he probably will put his nose to the grindstone for the rest of the year. Who knows? It really doesn't matter. When a person is, he will evolve regardless of whatever he likes or not, and in any particular instance as far as earth will allow him. And if he dies before he's evolved very much, well, it's just too bad for that man. But it does not exclude any ambition in any direction of that what I now call emotional or intellectual, and aside from physical development - no one can object if I want to become a wrestler.

Lou: My feeling about Gurdjieff and the method was specifically...

MR. NYLAND: No, no, we were trying to get away from it. If you have any feeling about Gurdjieff and the method, then you can tell him, but we will not talk about it tonight. I faithfully tried to stay clear from it.

See you next week, I hope. As I said before, try to bring questions for your own sake because the fact that you will ask might give you a little trembling fear and perhaps you might even become a little hysterical that in the presence of others you may have to say something. Well, that kind of a stage fright is probably very useful. And if you do, you'll find out that you could derive quite a bit of benefit. The alternative is one remains a sponge.

So I see you next week, I hope. Good night.

END TAPE

Transcribed: Sherryl Destephano
Rough: Jessica Haim
1st Proof: J. Cattabiani
2nd Proof: Roberta Bluestein
3rd Proof: Laile Amo
Final Type: Lenore Beach